



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON THE COMPOSITION OF 2 SAMUEL.

BY STANLEY A. COOK, M.A. (CANTAB.),

Hornsey, London, England.

The narratives of which 2 Samuel is composed are of unique importance for the student of Hebrew history. They are our only old source for the life and age of David, and a clear conception of their aim and contents is the key to a consistent view of the times which immediately precede and follow. It is fortunate, therefore, that criticism can be applied more easily to the material at our command in 2 Samuel than is the case with the few chapters in 1 Samuel (too often of Ephraimite origin) which recount David's earlier history.

It is generally agreed that, relatively, the latest passage in this book is chap. 7, while the fact that the connection between chaps. 9-20 and 1 Kings, chaps. 1, 2, is broken by chaps. 21-24 shows that the latter was placed in its present position after the separation of the books of Samuel and Kings had been effected. As for the rest of the book, it is agreed that we have plainly the work of more than one hand. In the case of chaps. 9-20, however, criticism is unanimous that, apart from a few glosses, these chapters are from one writer, and that they form, perhaps, the oldest and most trustworthy section in the whole book. In short, it is generally held that the book shows few traces of editing; it has, in fact, suffered more from the copyist (as is shown by the state of the text) than the editor.¹

The present article has grown out of a study of Absalom's rebellion. From a consideration of certain peculiarities in the narrative the writer came to the conclusion that it had suffered considerable revision, and was to be assigned to an earlier period of David's life—before he became king over all Israel. To estimate the bearing this had upon the rest of the book a new study

¹ Mention should be made of Kautzsch's opinion, *Abriß d. Gesch. d. alttest. Schrift.* (1897). Apart from E (probably 1:6-10, 13-16), D (7:1-12, 14-29), and passages of unknown origin (chiefly in chaps. 8; 21:3-14; 23:16-7; 24), he finds two sources: (1) a Jerusalem narrative (time of Solomon or Rehoboam), in chaps. 5; 6; 9-11; 12-20 (a few passages excepted); and (2) a David narrative (most probably Judean tenth or ninth century), in chaps. 1-4; 5; 21:15 *seq.*; 23:8-39 (a few passages excepted)

of the remaining chapters in 2 Samuel became necessary. Fresh light seemed to be thrown upon certain features which, if they did not bear directly upon the main issue, appeared at least to be of equal interest. A separate discussion of these was impossible at this stage, and hence it seemed desirable to throw the following pages into the form of an independent contribution to the analysis of 2 Samuel, and to aim at presenting material for future investigation and criticism.

Throughout the following pages frequent use has been made of Budde's *Richter und Samuel*, and the introductions, commentaries, and handbooks of Cornill, Driver, Kittel, Klostermann, Kuenen (*Einleitung*, Erster Teil), Reuss, Stade, Wellhausen, and Winckler.² In referring to the sources of 1 Samuel Budde's analysis in the *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* has been generally followed. It should be mentioned, however, that his J and E represent the Judean and Ephraimite documents respectively, and it is still an open question whether these correspond to the familiar Yahwist and Elohist of Hexateuchal criticism.

For the sake of convenience the narratives have been divided into eight sections: § 1, chaps. 1-4; § 2, chaps. 5-8; 21-24; § 3, chaps. 9-12; § 4, chaps. 13-19, the history of Absalom; § 5, chaps. 19-20:22, Sheba's revolt; § 6, the interviews in chaps. 16, 19; § 7, 1 Kings, chaps. 1, 2; and § 8, general results.

§ 1. *Chapters 1-4.*—*a*) The first section of this book is chiefly concerned with the history of David and Ishbaal (Ishbosheth), Saul's successor, chaps. 1-4. To this, chap. 1, which describes the manner in which David receives the news of Saul's death, is an introduction. The account of Saul's death, as has been often observed, does not agree with that in 1 Sam., chap. 31, and seems to be explained best by Budde (p. 238, *cf. SBOT.*),³ who ascribes 1:6-10, 13-16 to E. He is doubtless right in assigning vs. 5 to JE, since Jonathan, who is mentioned in David's inquiry (*ibid.*), is absent from the following verses. The description of the messenger's fate appears to have suffered some redaction; in 1:15 the Amalekite is slain by one of David's followers,

² Professor H. P. Smith's *Books of Samuel*, in the International Critical Commentary series, appeared after the MS. of this article was sent off.

³ *SBOT.* = *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, edited by Paul Haupt.—Kuenen (*Einleitung*, § 21, note 9) suggests that the two accounts are doublets. No stress should be laid upon the use of הָאִישׁ (vs. 2) and הַיָּעָר (vss. 5, 6); similarly in 1 Sam. 4:16 *sq.* we find both הָאִישׁ and הַמְּבַשֵּׁר. There is a slight resemblance between these two passages; *cf.* מִה הִיָּה הָרֹבֵר, vs. 16; 2 Sam. 1:4a, and vs. 12b; 2 Sam. 1:2a.

whereas in 4:10 allusion seems to be made to another (earlier?) tradition wherein he is killed by David himself. There may have been two traditions in circulation, but linguistic criteria in chap. 1 suggest that the older tradition has been replaced by one tending to remove the stain of bloodshed from David's hand.⁴

The chapter concludes with David's lament over Saul and Jonathan quoted from the book of Jashar (vss. 17 *sqq.*). The question of its Davidic authorship will rest partly upon psychological grounds (Budde, p. 238), and partly also upon our conception of the relation subsisting between Judah and Israel at Saul's death. It is to be noticed that the song is addressed to Israel, and with Israel alone is it essentially concerned, thus rendering it difficult to accept Klostermann's ingenious reading in vs. 18 (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל קָשָׁת) .

Stade (*Geschichte*, Vol. I, p. 257) has pointed out that the natural sequence to 1 Sam., chap. 31, is to be found in 2 Sam., chap. 2, and, indeed, chap. 1 does not appear to belong to the original groundwork of David's history. Its obvious purpose is to account for the transmission of the regalia from Saul to David, whence it is probable that it has been introduced by the redactor, who combined the two histories of David and Saul.⁵ The evident sympathy for Saul and his house naturally suggests an Ephraimite origin, and in this connection it is worth remembering that it is E, also, who, in Josh. 10:13, has again quoted the book of Jashar. We perhaps owe the introduction of the song to the author of vs. 5, with which verse the mention of Jonathan (vss. 22, 23, 25 *sq.*) connects itself.

b) Chap. 2 resumes the personal history of David, and is, therefore, the immediate continuation of 1 Sam., chap. 30. He leaves Ziklag and goes up to Hebron, where the men of Judah come to anoint him (vss. 1-4a). The abruptly introduced mention of the men of Jabesh-Gilead (vss. 4b-7) rests upon 1 Sam. 31:11 *sqq.* (Saul's history), and, with Meyer (*Gesch. d. Altertums*, Vol. I, § 297), does not belong to the original narrative.

⁴ "House of Israel" (vs. 12b) in Hexateuch only P, but once D² in Josh. 21:43, E² in 1 Sam. 7:2 *sq.*; in 1 Kings 12:21 D. For 2 Samuel see 6:5, 15; 12:8; 16:3. "People of Yahweh" (*ibid.*), 1 Sam. 2:24 E²; "anointed of Yahweh" (vs. 14), R² in 1 Sam. 2:35 (*cf.* vs. 10), E² in 1 Sam. 12:3, 5, and Midrash in 1 Sam. 16:6. In earlier narratives 1 Sam. 26:9, 11, 23 (E) and in 24:7, 11 (J, according to Budde).

⁵ This he has done by prefixing vss. 1-2a (to "the third day"), a strikingly precise notice which does not appear to agree with the situation represented in 1 Sam., chap. 30. It has probably been derived from 1 Sam. 30:1 (three days' journey from Aphek to Ziklag).

Ishbaal is crowned by Abner at Mahanaim, and rules over Benjamin, Ephraim, Jezreel, Gilead, etc. The extensive district over which he held sway may be understood if we assume that he was a vassal of the Philistines (*cf.* Kamphausen, *ZATW.*, Vol. VI, pp. 43 *sqq.*). Continuing, vss. 10*a*, 11 are acknowledged glosses (Wellhausen, Budde), but the close similarity between 10*b* ("but the house of Judah followed David") and 20:2; 1 Kings 12:20 makes it probable that vss. 10, 11 are both from the same hand.

Next we meet with certain details of the war between Ishbaal and David. Vss. 14–16 describe a small skirmish at Gibeon; the story is possibly an etymologizing attempt to explain the name חֵלְקֵת הַצְּדִירִים (Budde, p. 240).⁶ Vs. 17, on the other hand, speaks of a big battle wherein the men of Israel are beaten; vss. 18–24 a self-contained narrative follows with the account of Asahel's death. The latter can hardly be connected with the preceding passages (note the fresh introduction, vs. 18), nor does it seem to be the prelude to vss. 25 *sqq.*⁷ In the verses which follow, vs. 27*a* (with the use of אֱלֹהִים) can scarcely refer to vs. 14 (RV mg.); a fight would surely have occurred under any circumstance, and, as Driver (*Books of Samuel*, p. 188) notes, the verse must refer to vs. 26. The chapter concludes with the cessation of the war (vs. 28; *cf.* vs. 30*a*), and Abner's return to Mahanaim (vs. 29).

In chap. 3 vs. 6*b* follows immediately upon vs. 1, vss. 2–5 belong to chap. 8, and vs. 6*a* is the redactor's addition (*cf.* Budde, *SBOT.*). Vs. 1 directly contradicts 2:28, and the use of בֵּית דָּוִד (vs. 1; *cf.* 1 Sam. 20:16 R^{JE}; 2 Sam. 7:26, see below), אֶרֶץ (*ibid.*, rarely before D), and דָּל (*ibid.*, Gen. 41:19; Exod. 23:3 E, but Judg. 6:15 J), favors the assumption that vss. 1, 6*b sqq.* have been worked over (at least) by a later hand (מתחזק, vs. 6*b*, see our note on 10:12, § 3, *c*). Further support is found in the words of Abner (vss. 9 *sq.*; note אֱלֹהִים, vs. 9*a*), which are related to the passages in 1 Samuel where David is spoken of as accepted by Yahweh, all of which, however, are later than J (1 Sam.

⁶ LXX presupposes חֵלְקֵת הַצְּדִירִים "portion of the plotters," and the context suggests חֵלְקֵת הַצְּדִירִים "portion of the sides." For conjectures the writer may be permitted to refer to his article *Helkath-Hazzurim* in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. II. *Cf.* חֵלְקֵת in Gen. 33:19; Josh. 24:32 E; see also 2 Sam. 14:30 *sq.*; 23:11 *sq.* below.

⁷ Wellhausen, however (*Die Bücher Samuelis*, *ad loc.*), suggests the original identity of גִּבְעַת אֲמָה (vs. 24) and גִּבְעַת אַחֲזָה (vs. 25).

15:28 E²; 16:1, 12 Midrash; 18:12a E; 28:17 R^{JE}).⁸ A similar feeling is observed in vss. 17 sq., where זְקֵרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל points to E (cf. 1 Sam. 4:3 E; 8:4 E²).⁹ That 2:12–16 is older than 1 Sam. 18:20–29; 19:11–17, has been rightly noticed by Marquart (*Fundamente*, p. 24). But is our passage conflate, or should we read “Abner” for “Ishbaal” in vss. 14, 15? Why should David send to Ishbaal for Michal when, as we learn from vs. 13, the marriage was to confirm the *secret* alliance which Abner was seeking with David?

Vs. 30 is ascribed to a late redactor (see *SBOT.*), and, by the unexpected inclusion of Abishai, is obviously to be connected with vss. 29 and 39, which, instead of Joab alone, speak of “Joab’s house” and the “sons of Zeruah.” The lament which follows (vss. 33, 34) may be an insertion; vss. 32b and 34b are closely parallel, and בְּנֵי עִלְהָ recurs in 2 Sam. 7:10 (see below), and elsewhere in later passages. Suspicion attaches itself also to David’s curse in vss. 28 sqq., from the awkward manner in which it is introduced (וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה בְּאִתְּחִירֵיכֶן; for a parallel construction cf. 2 Chron. 32:23b), and from its unfriendly feeling toward Joab (see below, § 6, b).

There is little to notice with respect to chap. 4. The tradition in vs. 10 has been already mentioned (see above), and David’s regard for Ishbaal reminds us of the Ephraimite tendency in chap. 1 (above).¹⁰

c) Not a few traces of redaction and combination of passages from different sources have been found throughout this section. We have no clear conception of the struggle between David and Ishbaal (cf. Stade, *Geschichte*, Vol. I, p. 262). We find traces of a narrative which suggests that Abner and Ishbaal are supported by Benjamin alone (2:14–16, 18–27, 30–32), whereas other verses presuppose that Joab is fighting against all Israel (vss. 17, 28). It is curious, moreover, that in chaps. 3 sq. there is nothing to suggest that Saul’s court is still at Mahanaim, with the possible exception of 4:7b.¹¹ This city is mentioned only in

⁸ “Dan to Beersheba” (vs. 10b) is generally late; cf. Budde, p. 258, and see especially Hope W. Hogg, “Dan to Beersheba,” in *Expositor*, Vol. VIII, pp. 411–21 (1898).

⁹ Probably J² in Exod. 3:16; 4:29; 12:21; E in Numb. 11:30; 16:25; Exod. 17:5, 6; 18:2; 24:1, 9; Josh. 24:1; and R^{JE} in Josh. 7:6. On 2 Sam. 5:3; 17:4, 15 see below, and on 1 Kings 8:1, 3 see Kuenen, § 25, note 2.

¹⁰ בְּנֵי (vs. 11b) is markedly D.

¹¹ The murderers of Ishbaal come (from Mahanaim?) “through the Arabah” to Hebron; cf. 2:29.

2:8, 12, 29; 2:8 *may* belong to an Ephraimite writer, and vss. 12, 13a, 17 . . . 28 sq. appear to form part of an originally independent account (R^{JE}?). Which is the more historical, the Benjamite or the Israel narrative?

It is well known that the Philistines, after their victory at Gilboa, occupied the cities in the northern plain at Jezreel, and since Saul's court was forced to flee across the Jordan, it would appear that Benjamite territory was no longer secure. It is, therefore, remarkable that the only recorded skirmish was in Benjamin, and that Abner seems to have stood at the head of this tribe, and exercised some authority over it (*cf.* 2:25, 31; 3:19).

Another noticeable peculiarity in chaps. 2-4 is the absence of all reference to the Philistines. It is natural to suppose that it would be in their interest to leave the rival houses of David and Saul in a state of warfare, and it has been plausibly conjectured that David, as well as Ishbaal, was their vassal. Consequently one expects that it would have been the Philistines' policy to preserve the balance of power, and it is difficult to understand for what reason they abstained from interference. As we know from 2 Sam. 5:17, they do not reappear until north and south are united and David has become king over all Israel.

§ 2. *Chapters 5-8.*—All the tribes come to David and anoint him king over Israel, he goes up to Jerusalem, the Philistines are driven away, and the ark is brought up. David proposes to build a house for the ark, but Nathan, at Yahweh's command, forbids him. Successful wars are waged against the surrounding nations, and we seem to reach the climax of David's history. His authority is felt far and wide, and in everything David perceives the hand of Yahweh working on behalf of His people.

It will be impossible to consider these chapters without taking into consideration the appendix (chaps. 20-24),¹² and since our intention is to gain an idea of the age and character of the various narratives, it will be convenient to classify the contents according to their subject-matter.

a) Narratives dealing with Jerusalem.—Following the introduction (see below) comes the abrupt notice of the capture of

¹² The position of chaps. 21-24 shows that they were inserted after the separation of the books of Samuel and Kings (Driver, *Introduction*, 6th ed., p. 183), but did the writer who inserted them leave them untouched? Chaps. 22-23:7, the song followed by the last words (*cf.* Deut., chaps. 32 sq., Moses' Song followed by the Blessing), are later. For 21:1-14 see below, § 3. Budde (*SBOT.*) arranges the narratives as follows: 5:1-3, 17-25; 21:15 sqq.; 23:8 sqq.; 5:6; 6:1; 5:7-12; 6:2 sqq.; chap. 7; 8:1-14; 3:2-5; 5:13-16; 5:4, 5; 8:15-18.

Jerusalem by David and his "men" (5:6 *sqq.*). Chap. 6:1, which mentions the assembling of thirty thousand of the chosen men of Israel, does not seem, therefore, to be an apt prelude (against Budde, p. 243). The notice of Hiram and his message in vss. 11 *sq.* probably refers to the latter part of David's reign, since the Phœnician king was a contemporary of Solomon (see Kittel, *History*, Vol. II, p. 157, note 2).¹³ It is possible, however, that he has been introduced from 1 Kings, chap. 5, just as the account of Saul's victories in 1 Sam. 14:47 seems to be based upon 2 Sam., chap. 8.

Chaps. 6, 7, which break the connection between 5:25 and 8:1, do not appear to belong to this section (*cf.* Stade, *Geschichte*, Vol. I, p. 266). Opinions vary as to the source of chap. 7. Wellhausen (*Hexateuch*, p. 257) and Kuenen (§ 22, note 5) ascribed it to D. Kittel, however (*History*, Vol. II, pp. 46 *sq.*, 160, note 2), and Budde (p. 244) would find in it traces of older material. It is sufficient for our purpose, however, to recollect that it is agreed that a hand later than J has worked over it.

Chap. 6 is composed of two incidents: (*α*) the bringing up of the ark from Baal of Judah to the house of Obed-Edom, and (*β*) its removal to Zion. These are kept distinct by the chronicler and characteristically treated after his own manner (1 Chron., chap. 13 = 2 Sam. 6:1–11; 1 Chron. 15:25 *sqq.* = 2 Sam. 6:12 *sqq.*). In vss. 2–4, 6, 7*b* (where David is accompanied by his "men") אלהים consistently recurs, but in vss. 5, 7*a*, 8 *sqq.* (where David is accompanied by Israel, vss. 5, 15, 19) the divine name is regularly יהוה (so read in vs. 12*b* with LXX, Lucian).¹⁴ The close resemblance between *α* and 1 Sam. 6:19–7:1 will not pass unnoticed. In view of the obvious relation between chap. 6 and chap. 7 it is not improbable that the former (derived from some "History of the Ark") has been introduced into its present position by the final editor of the latter.¹⁵ To him we may, perhaps,

¹³ See the article Hiram in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

¹⁴ With regard to the Yahweh-narrative it is noteworthy that vs. 5 has no real connection with the context, and that the words "the anger of Yahweh was kindled upon Uzzah" (vs. 7*a*) are a parallel to, and perhaps a gloss upon, "and Elohim smote him." יהוה occurs in vs. 2*b*, which is possibly a gloss.

¹⁵ On the whole chapter see Kusters, *Theolog. Tijdschr.*, 1893, pp. 361–78. 2 Sam. 6:20–23, which connects itself with vs. 16, is omitted by the chronicler (1 Chron. 16:43*b* = 2 Sam. 6:20*a*). Its tone is distinctly anti-Benjamite, and vs. 21, in particular, resembles in spirit such a passage as 3:9 *sq.* (on which see § 1, *b*, above). But 6:20–23 is very probably an addition. One notes that in *β* (and also in the יהוה fragment in *α*) David is king over all Israel, and that from 6:23 it is to be inferred that Michal has only just become David's wife.

ascribe 6:1, and see traces of his hand in such expressions as **בית ישראל** (6:5, see above on 1:12), and **ברך בשם** (6:18b; cf. Deut. 10:8; 21:5). Finally, we have chap. 24, relating the census of Israel, Yahweh's wrath, and the erection of the altar at the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite. Has the existence of an old altar been the origin of the narrative? The close relation between chaps. 24 and 21 has been frequently observed (see, e. g., Wellhausen, *Hexateuch*, p. 263); cf. further 24:13 (LXX) with 21:1 (the duration of the famine), and 24:15 (LXX) with 21:9b (the time of year), and see Kuenen, § 22, note 13. The exact source of this chapter can scarcely be decided; a number of noteworthy usages found in it are given in a note.¹⁶

b) *Wars*.—Incidents in the wars with the Philistines are found in 5:17–25; 21:15–22, and 23:8–39. In the first passage, the scene is laid in Baal-Perazim and the valley of Rephaim, and the Philistines are beaten from Gibeon to Gezer (cf. LXX and 1 Chron. 14:16). In the second, the scene is removed to Gob (read Gezer?) and Gath, and in the last we find amid various notices the account of a fight at Lehi (23:11), a list of David's heroes, and strangely enough a fragmentary passage where the Philistines are again in the valley of Rephaim and actually have a garrison in Bethlehem! It is, indeed, strange to find them so near the capital. It is evident that we have a number of fragments, secular and religious, which have been loosely brought into their position by a later hand (so also Wellhausen, *Die Bücher Samuelis*, p. 212, note), to whom we may *inter alia* ascribe the introduction, 5:17a.¹⁷ That they rest upon an old tradition we need not doubt;¹⁸ possibly, indeed, they once formed part of the "Book of the Wars of Yahweh," which is quoted by E in Numb. 21:14 sq.

¹⁶ כהם וכהם (vs. 3), see Deut. 1:11; עיני ראות, cf. Deut. 28:32. For the geographical description in vss. 5 sqq. (on text see Wellhausen, Klostermann, Driver, Budde) cf. Deut. 2:36; 3:12; Josh. 12:2; 13:9, 16; the mention of Tyre and Sidon is striking. For "Dan to Beersheba" (vs. 2) see on 3:10 above (note 8). נסכלתי (vs. 10), see Gen. 31:28 E; 1 Sam. 13:13 J² (so Budde); 26:21 E; for 2 Sam. 15:31 see § 4, e); מלאך יהוה (vs. 16), see on 14:17 below, § 4, a); הערה (vs. 17), cf. 2 Sam. 7:14 (see above), and for 2 Sam. 19:20 see § 6, b); מגפה (vs. 21) in Hexateuch E and P (plural in Exod. 9:14 J); with נעצר, cf. Numb. 17:13, 15; 25:8 P; רצה (vs. 23), old in Gen. 33:10; Deut. 33:11, 24, generally D and later. In vs. 24 the order שנקלים חמשים is unusual and generally late (cf. Driver, *ad loc.*). את ארז for את ארז, characteristic of the Elisha narratives (1 Kings, chap. 20—2 Kings, chap. 8), recurs in Josh. 10:25; 14:12 D (cf. Driver, *Introduction*, 6th ed., p. 188, note).

¹⁷ Note also vs. 24, "Yahweh will go before thee," and cf. Deut. 9:3; Judg. 4:14 (E, so Budde, Moore). חלקה in 23:11 sq. is also a sign of E; cf. on 2:16 above, § 1, b).

¹⁸ E. g., the notice of the slaying of Goliath in 2 Sam. 21:19 as compared with 1 Sam., chap. 17.

In chap. 8 we have some account of David's campaigns which, in its present form, shows signs of much revision and redaction (according to Budde, *SBOT.*, vss. 1-6a R^D, 6b, 11, 12 R^P).¹⁹ Compared with chap. 10 the chapter is a panegyric idealizing David's successes; see further below, § 3, c).

c) *Family and official lists.*—Little need be said respecting the family lists. Amnon (3:2) was the son of the Jezreelite Ahinoam, and Dodiel (so Klostermann, and Marquart, *Fundamente*, p. 25; MT, דָּוִיָּאֵל, דָּוִיָּאֵל) was the son of Abigail the Carmelite. The third, Absalom b. Maacah, was the grandson of Talmai king of Geshur. Since David's first two wives came from the south of Judah, we can hardly suppose that in the case of Absalom the Aramean state of Geshur is referred to (*cf.* Josh. 12:5). It is not easy to see how David at this early period of his life was able to contract an alliance with so distant a principality, and it becomes more probable, and indeed agrees better with his policy to suppose, that Geshur is the less known south-Palestinian district which seems to have been situated beyond the Philistine territory (*cf.* Josh. 13:2; 1 Sam. 27:8, and see below § 4, b). The fourth son, Adonijah, is briefly styled "ben Haggith," possibly a corruption of בֶּן-הַגִּתִּית "son of the Gittite (woman)."

The list of officers, 8:16 *sqq.*, recurs in 20:23 *sqq.*, where, however, it seems out of place. As Bonk has already suggested, it is probable that these lists are comparatively late (see *ZATW.*, Vol. XI, p. 142). Benaiah, for example, is nowhere mentioned in the following narratives (9-20:22), and the head of the Cherethites and Pelethites, so far from being Benaiah, was Joab (*cf.* 20:7, and on text see Budde, *SBOT.*). Possibly the LXX addition to 1 Kings, chap. 2, is more correct in styling him chief τοῦ πλυνθείου (vs. 46h), *i. e.*, of the מִלְכָּה or "brick-kiln" (?);²⁰ *cf.* 2 Sam. 12:31, Keri.

d) It is evident that this section comprises a number of heterogeneous fragments of various ages and sources (*cf.* Wellhausen, *Hexateuch*, p. 258), and has as much right to be ascribed to the oldest narrator as the appendix (chaps. 21-24), which, in the matter of contents, it closely resembles. The *terminus a quo* of

¹⁹ Also חֵיָל (vs. 9) with the meaning "army" in Hexateuch P, in 1 Sam. 17:20 E; 10:26 R^{JE}.

²⁰ The exact meaning of the word is very uncertain.

the various incidents is apparently fixed by the introduction, 5:3, which dates this section at the anointing of David over all Israel, *i. e.*, seven years after the death of Saul (*cf.* vs. 5*a*). Internal evidence, however, as well as the existence of several phraseological criteria, make it probable that this introduction, a twofold one (vss. 3 and 1 *sq.*), is late, and that it has proceeded from the editors who have collected and revised the several fragments which follow.²¹

When once we recognize that these introductions are due to later editors, we are able to gain a rather different, and perhaps a clearer, conception of the early history of David's reign. The few encounters between David and the Philistines which are recorded will belong to a time when David had not become king over all Israel, and apparently precede the incidents in chaps. 2-4, where we find, strangely enough, no mention of the Philistines (*cf.* also Asahel's name among David's heroes in 23:24). In these fights David has neither "host" (צבא) nor "army" (חיל) as in chap. 8 or 10, but is accompanied only by his "men" or "servants" (*cf.* 5:21; 21:15, 17).

It seems difficult (following the accepted view) to believe that David was already king of Israel when he took refuge in the "hold" (מַצְדָּה) from the Philistines who came out against him (5:17). It is more probable that David had been previously engaged in subduing the Philistines around Jerusalem at the same time as Ishbaal and Abner were fighting those who had settled in the more northerly parts of Palestine (1 Sam. 31:7). The absence of the Philistines in chaps. 2-4 may then be due to the fact that they had become a negligible quantity. David probably seized Jerusalem before he became king over Israel. In Ziklag his rule had extended over his "friends" in the Negeb, whose support it was perhaps necessary to assure with gifts (1 Sam. 30:26 *sqq.*).²² How lasting his success was we shall see when we come to consider the rebellion of Absalom.

²¹ שְׁבַטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל is found in J in Gen. 49:16; JE in Josh. 4:5, 8; 7:16; E in Josh. 3:12; 24:1. In Judg. 18:1; 20:2, 10; 21:8 post-exilic (Moore). Also in 1 Sam. 2:28 RP; 10:20 E²; 15:17 E; once J (?) in 1 Sam. 9:21. In 2 Samuel it occurs in 7:7; 15:2, 10; 19:10; 20:14; 24:2. For 1 Kings 8:16; 11:32 see Kuenen, § 25, note 2. הַמְּבִיאָה וְהַמְּצִיאָה (vs. 2), *cf.* 1 Sam. 18:13 E²; רעה, here first in the metaphorical sense (*cf.* 7:7), and frequently in Jeremiah. The promise in vs. 2*b* is related to 1 Sam. 13:14 J²; 15:28 E; 16:1-13 (Midrash), and for זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (vs. 3) *cf.* above on 3:17. נָגִיד (vs. 2), however, is found only in J in 1 Samuel (9:16; 10:1; 13:14; 25:30).

²² Stade (*Geschichte*, Vol. I, p. 259) suggests that the passage refers to the time immediately following Saul's death.

In Hebron, David seems to have been able to increase his power by alliances, thus gaining, doubtless, some hold over Jezreel, Carmel, and Geshur. By driving out the Philistines from the north of Judah he would be better able to devote his energies to the more northerly tribes. It would be rash to assume that the extension of his power over all Israel followed immediately after the death of Ishbaal—we can hardly suppose that there was no one to lead the north against David. The editor of chaps. 5–8 has simply attempted to thrust back the date of David's rule over the united north and south, just as the chronicler, by omitting 2 Sam., chaps. 1–4, made David's supremacy begin immediately after the death of Saul.

§ 3. *Chapters 9–12.*—The following chaps. 9–20 (together with 1 Kings, chaps. 1, 2) comprise the so-called “court history” or “family history” of David. They may easily be divided into two parts: chaps. 13–20, narrating the rebellion of Absalom and Sheba's rising; chaps. 9–12, a collection of narratives which deal with *a*) Mephibosheth (chap. 9), *b*) the circumstances attending the birth of Solomon (11:2–12:25), and *c*) the Ammonite war (chap. 10; 11:1; 12:26 *sqq.*).

In considering *a*) it will be necessary to take into account 21:1–14, which, according to Budde (pp. 256 *sq.*), should immediately precede it. It is difficult, however, to ascribe both narratives to the same writer or age. In chap. 21 David deliberately hands over seven of the sons of Saul to the Gibeonites,²³ whereas in chap. 9 this is ignored, and David, apparently unaware of their fate, has to inquire whether there are yet any of Saul's house alive. David's solicitude toward Saul's descendants is marked, and the whole motive of the chapter is David's acknowledgment of the obligation entailed by his covenant with Jonathan. Chap. 9 is obviously related, therefore, to 1 Sam. 20:15 *sqq.*, R^{JE}; *cf.* 18:3 E² and 24:21 R^{JE},²⁴ and we are probably justified in ascribing it to E;²⁵ to determine the source of chap. 21, on the other hand, is more difficult. The chapter seems to refer to a comparatively early period in David's history, when he was feeling his way to an extension of power, and by complying with

²³ Vs. 7 (the saving of Mephibosheth) may be a gloss (*cf.* Budde).

²⁴ Besides אֱלֹהִים (9:3), the use of שָׂדֶה (9:7) to denote a single field (and not “country” collectively) possibly points to E (*cf.* Holzinger, *Einleitung*, § 13, p. 105).

²⁵ The chapter seems to follow upon chap. 4 (*cf.* הָכִי יִשְׁמְרֵךְ אֲשֶׁר נֹתַר, 9:1). and probably belonged originally to a somewhat earlier stage in David's history.

the request of the Gibeonites may have hoped to obtain their good services. It agrees with the benevolence shown by David to Saul's house to suppose that the burial of the remains of Saul and Jonathan (vs. 12) would have been attended to at an earlier period. Whatever be its ultimate source, the narrative lies imbedded in a later frame, and shows some signs of having been worked over by a later editor.²⁶

b) The story of David's sin with Bathsheba and the birth of Solomon (11:2—12:25) is inserted in the account of a war against Rabbath-Ammon, of which it was originally independent. Our story commences abruptly with the vague notice "and it came to pass one evening." Joab and the men of Israel and Judah are besieging a certain city; its name, as well as that of the enemy, is unmentioned.²⁷ In vs. 11 יְשִׁבִים בַּסִּכּוֹת seems superfluous by the side of עַל-פְּנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה חָנִים, and should we read with Lucian "the ark of God, and Israel and Judah," etc., we surely have a gloss.²⁸ Further, in vs. 12, David undertakes to send Uriah away on the morrow, whereas vss. 13 sq. show that the latter does not depart until the third day (on the text see Budde, *SBOT.*) David in his letter (vs. 15) orders Joab to place Uriah in a dangerous position and desert him, whereas in the continuation of the narrative he is slain along with other warriors in a general onslaught (vs. 17; cf. vs. 24). Has a glossator endeavored to minimize David's treachery? Finally, the introduction of Abimelech at the close of the chapter is hardly an apt parallel; it is not easy to see how the city was to be taken unless the army approached the wall. The story of Abimelech in Judg., chap. 9, occupies a unique position in the "History of the Judges" (see Moore, *SBOT.*, English translation), and the account of his death (vss. 42 sqq.) is due to E.²⁹

In 12:1–25 Nathan reproves David for his sin, Bathsheba becomes David's wife, and with the birth of Solomon the repentant king is restored to the divine favor. Already Schwally (*ZATW.*, Vol. XII, p. 153) has suggested that vss. 1–15a are a later insertion, but it is probable that the whole of 11:27b—12:24a, 25 has

²⁶ For expressions later than J cf. דָּמָה (vs. 5), Judg. 20:5; Numb. 33:56 (P), and on נָחֵלֶת יֵר (vs. 3) see 14:16 below. For חָמֶל (vs. 7, a gloss?) cf. 1 Sam. 15:3, 9, 15; Exod. 2:6 E; 1 Sam. 23:21 J(?); for 2 Sam. 12:4, 6 see below. Elsewhere Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, and later.

²⁷ A name might have been expected, e. g., in vs. 17.

²⁸ Cf. the late Lev. 23:42 sq.; Neh. 8:14, 17.

²⁹ גִּבְר (2 Sam. 11:23) in Hexateuch only E and D.

been written to render Solomon's birth as stainless as possible.³⁰ The insertion is twofold: (α) 11:27b; 12:15–24a; (β) 12:1–15a, 25, and it is noteworthy that in (β), which is a later addition to (α), we find the only allusion to the Ammonite war (vs. 9). It is equally noteworthy that the only reference to Uriah in the historical books is found in 1 Kings 15:5, a passage whose genuineness is not free from suspicion (Kuenen, § 26, note 7).³¹

Omitting *b*) as a lengthy and complicated narrative artificially inserted in its present position, there remains *c*), a running account of the Ammonite war,³² the sequel to chap. 10. Chap. 10, compared with chap. 8, is a perfectly straightforward account of David's successes (vss. 15–19a are, however, open to suspicion). It is not our intention to analyze the account of these wars; we ask, rather, whether they could have occurred before the events related in chaps. 13–20. The hospitality with which David was received in Mahanaim (17:27 *sqq.*) has always been difficult to understand in view of the sanguinary war he had previously waged against Ammon. Instead of large armies chaps. 13 *sqq.* seem to presuppose mere bodyguards (15:18; 20:7; see below), and David does not appear to possess the authority and power which the accounts of the successful wars in chaps. 8 and 10 imply. Whatever be the source of chap. 10—and there are a few data which point to a hand later than J³³—we venture the

³⁰ 12:24b accordingly follows immediately after 11:27a.

³¹ The chronicler characteristically goes farther than the writer in 2 Samuel and makes Solomon the *youngest* of the four sons of Bathsheba (1 Chron. 3:5). That Solomon was really the *first-born* has been conjectured also (on different grounds) by Marquart, *Fundamente*, p. 26. The present writer based his conjecture on the linguistic evidences which were found in chap. 12: בן-מור (vs. 5), cf. 1 Sam. 26:16 (E); חמל (vs. 6), see on 21:7 above, § 3, *a*); "I have anointed thee" (vs. 7); cf. 1 Sam. 16:13 (Midrash); בזה (vss. 9 *sq.*), cf. 1 Sam. 2:30 R^D; 10:27 R^JE; 17:42 E; העביר with חמא (vs. 13), cf. 24:10 (§ 2, *a*); אלהים (vs. 16); בוך (vs. 19), in Gen. 41:33, 39; 1 Sam. 3:8 E; once J in 1 Sam. 16:18 (so Budde) (vs. 20), of garments, in Hexateuch E; בית יהודה (vs. 20), an anachronism (Reuss, Wellhausen). ריהורא אהב (vs. 24b) is probably a gloss; observe (*a*) its position, (*b*) the order of the words, and (*c*) אהב, with יהורא as subject, is a mark of D (Holzinger, *Einleitung*, p. 284).

³² The text of 2 Sam. 12:26–29 is difficult. עיר המים (vs. 27b) appears to be identical with עיר המלכה in 26b; both are doubtless corrupt, and Cheyne (*Expository Times*, December, 1897, pp. 143 *sq.*) reads עיר מלכום "city of Milcom." Vss. 28 *sq.* expressly state that the city has not yet been taken, whence it follows that vss. 26b and 27b גם-לכדתי המים את-עיר המים, etc.) must either be hopelessly corrupt or else glosses. The repetition of the notice of the destruction of Ammon (11:1; 12:31) and of the siege of Rabbah (11:1, צור; 12:26, נלחם) indicates editorial revision.

³³ רגל (10:3), generally E or later; cf. Budde, p. 145; חקר (*ibid.*), cf. Deut. 13:15; Judg. 18:2, and 1 Sam. 20:12 R^JE. הוהחזק (vs. 12), cf. Numb. 13:20; 1 Sam. 4:9 E, but Gen. 48:2; 1 Sam. 30:6 J; for 3:6 cf. § 1, *b*) above. כלם (vs. 5), cf. Numb. 12:14 E, but 1 Sam. 20:34; 25:7, 15 E; in Judg. 18:7 corrupt. נקרא שם (12:28), cf. Gen. 48:16 E; 2 Sam. 6:2 (later than J? See § 2, *a*).

suggestion that, chronologically, the wars of David should follow, and not precede, the events related in chaps. 13–20. Further support for this will be pointed out below.

§ 4, *Chapters 13–19: The history of Absalom*.—Chaps. 13 *sqq.* deal with the revolt of Absalom and, in their present position, are closely connected with the account of Sheba's short-lived rising. Chaps. 13, 14 form an introduction to the following chapters (15 *sqq.*), of which, with the solitary exception of the reference in 15:8 to Geshur (*cf.* 13:37 *sq.*; 14:23, 32), they are virtually independent.

a) In chap. 13 the use of **התחלה** in a twofold sense (vs. 2, he fell sick; vs. 6, he feigned himself sick) and the occurrence of **הכם** (more frequently E and later; see below) and **יָלַל** (see on 3:1, above) would suggest that vss. 3–6a, which tend to throw part of the guilt of Absalom's crime upon Jonadab, are secondary; in vs. 32 Jonadab is introduced as a new character. The closing verses have clearly suffered some transposition: vss. 34a, 37a, 38a (the flight of Absalom) are parallels, but Klostermann in the first would read **ויתר אהיו שלום** (connecting with vs. 33). Vs. 38a is an insertion, the correct order being: vss. 36, 37b, 37a, 38b, 39 (Wellhausen, Driver, Budde), and it is difficult, therefore, to avoid suspecting the genuineness of the chronological note, vs. 38b, which may have been a marginal note. Chap. 14 betrays the hand of a later scribe, but there is no sign of any legal regulation for blood-revenge, and the chapter may be pre-deuteronomic.³⁴ Vss. 25–27 are recognized glosses, but since vs. 28b = vs. 24b, it is probable that vs. 28 is equally intrusive. The construction **שנחיים ימים** (*ibid.*) may point to E; *cf.* Gen. 41:1 (E). In the closing verses we may again find traces of E in

³⁴ **הכם** (vs. 2), old in Deut. 32:6, 29; Judg. 5:29; doubtful in Exod. 1:10; in Gen. 41:33, 39 E, elsewhere D (Deut. 1:13, 15; 4:6; 16:19), and in poetry; *cf.* also 1 Kings 2:9 (§ 7, c); 5:11, and for 2 Samuel *cf.* 14:20 and 20:16. **הַכְמָה**, 1 Kings 2:6; Deut. 4:6; 34:9 (elsewhere in Hexateuch P); for 2 Samuel *cf.* 14:20; 20:22. **נָאֵל הָדָם** (vs. 11), in Hexateuch D and P. **עַם אֱלֹהִים**, *cf.* Judg. 20:2 (post-exilic), and note the consistent use of **אֱלֹהִים** throughout this chapter. **נָחֻלַת אֱלֹהִים** (vs. 16), *cf.* **יְהוָה** 'נ', 1 Sam. 26:19 E; *cf.* also 2 Sam. 20:19; 21:3. **מִלֵּאךְ הָאֱלֹהִים** (vs. 17), J in Judg. 13:6, 9; 1 Sam. 29:9; for 2 Sam. 19:28 see § 6, a); in Hexateuch E. **יְהוָה** 'מ', J in Gen. 16:7, 11, but Exod. 3:2; Numb. 22:22 *sqq.* doubtful; E² in Gen. 22:11, *ibid.* 15 R^{JE}. Other old passages are Judg. 2:1a; 5:23; 6:11 *sq.*; 13:3, 13, 15 *sqq.*; for 2 Sam. 24:16 see above, § 2, b). **מִדְבָּר** (vs. 13), *cf.* the similar form in Numb. 7:89 (P); Ezek. 2:2; 43:6. **אָשֶׁם** (*ibid.*), *cf.* Gen. 42:21 E. **וְרָא** (vs. 15), in Piel; *cf.* 2 Chron. 32:18; Neh. 6:9, 14. **אָמָה** (*ibid.*), in Hexateuch E. **שִׁפְחָה** (vss. 12, 15, 17) is indeed a sign of J, but its genuineness is not free from doubt, since LXX in vs. 17 presupposes **אָשֶׁה**; see Wellhausen, *Die Bücher Samuelis*, *ad loc.* Vss. 15–17 carry the woman back to her plea on behalf of her boy and should perhaps come between vss. 7 and 8. **חַי נַפְשֶׁךְ** (vs. 19), *cf.* 1 Sam. 1:26 (E²); 17:55 (E). **הַמִּין וְהַשְׂמִיל** (vs. 19); *cf.* D's **סָר רִמְיָן וְשִׂמְאֵל** (Driver, *Introduction*, p. 101, note 30).

חלקה (vs. 30; see above on 2:16), and in the construction of נשק with ל (cf. Holzinger, *Einleitung*, p. 107). For vs. 32b cf. 1 Sam. 20:8 (R^{JE}).

b) The remaining chapters (15 *sqq.*) proceed with the account of the revolt. Absalom steals the hearts of all Israel (15:6) and four years later (vs. 7, LXX) raises the standard in Hebron. At the trumpet-call he is to be proclaimed king. Gradually the men of Israel fall away to him, and David, accompanied only by the Cherethites, Pelethites, and 600 Gittites, is forced to flee. Absalom and all Israel come to Jerusalem (16:15), and a council of war is held with the elders (cf. 17:4, 14a). David is informed of their plans and hurriedly crosses over the Jordan to Mahanaim (17:22, 24). A fight ensues, Absalom is killed, and all Israel return to their homes (18:17b; cf. 19:9b). All the tribes are in confusion, and finally David, by offering to Amasa (Absalom's general) the post held by Joab, becomes reconciled with Judah, who come to meet him at Gilgal (19:12-16). David now realizes that he is king over Israel (vs. 23). A quarrel, however, has sprung up between Israel and Judah (vss. 42-44), which culminates in the revolt of the Benjamite Sheba (chap. 20). All Israel follow him, and Judah alone remain faithful to the king. But the Benjamite is put to flight, and the rising is speedily quelled by Joab (20:22).

The events in chaps. 15-20, as the above brief outline shows, do not by any means give the impression that David was then king over all Israel. If Absalom had all Israel on his side, it is difficult to see how David could collect a force strong enough to meet him. Surely he would have been easily defeated. It seems not improbable, therefore, that the revolt has been exaggerated, and that it was Judah alone which took part in the rebellion.³⁵ This view is clearly suggested in 19:12 *sqq.*, and finds support in the fact that the two leading men in Absalom's rebellion were men of Judah. Amasa was a Jezreelite (Jezreel in Judah; see Marquart, *Fundamente*, p. 24, after 17:25, Lucian), and Ahithophel belonged to the south Judean town of Giloh. Further support is to be found in the choice of Hebron as the meeting-place of the rebels. Had "all Israel" shared in the revolt, we should have looked for the rallying-place in Benjamin, or even in a more

³⁵ Similarly, e. g., Sayce, *The Early History of the Hebrews*, pp. 429 *sq.* On the part played by Benjamin in this revolt see § 6.

northerly site, whereas for Judah the old capital would not unnaturally form the most suitable center.

The land of Geshur, whither Absalom fled, was the home of his mother Maacah, and, as we have already seen (see above, § 2, c), was situated to the south of Philistine territory ("in Aram," 15:8, is a gloss). It is perhaps permissible to identify his mother with the Maacah whose son Achish received David at Gath.³⁶

The tribe of Judah was largely composed of Calebites, Jerahmeelites, and other non-Israelite peoples of the Negeb (*cf.* 1 Chron., chap. 2, and see Wellhausen, *De Gentibus*, etc.), and does not appear to have become prominent before David's time. In Hebron David would be easily able to retain firm hold upon these clans, with some of whom he was allied by marriage,³⁷ and it follows that it would not be until his removal to Jerusalem that any suitable opportunity for revolt would present itself to them.

c) Supported by the chronological notices which are found, the revolt is placed in the last decade of David's reign (*cf.* Stade, *Geschichte*, Vol. I, p. 284, note 1; Kittel, Vol. II, p. 175, note). These notices are four in number. In the first (13:23a) the expression *לשנתיים ימים* (two years, *i. e.*, after the outrage upon Tamar) may point to E (Gen. 41:1). For 13:38b (Absalom in Geshur two years) and 14:28a (Absalom in Jerusalem two years) see above, *ad loc.* The fourth is 15:7a, which states that four (so LXX) years elapsed between the time when Absalom *openly* revolted (by preparing his fifty chariots and men) and his departure to Hebron. Although these doubtless rest upon some (late?) chronological scheme,³⁸ they cannot be unreservedly accepted in our narrative. The general tenor of the chapters supports a date previous to the great campaigns in chaps. 8 and 10 (*cf.* above, § 2, c), and it is preferable to place the revolt shortly after David

³⁶ Maacah recurs as the name of a concubine of Caleb (1 Chron. 2:48), and Tamar (Absalom's sister) is the name of a town in the south of Palestine (Ezek. 48:28). Talmi (Absalom's grandfather) is also the name borne by a Hebronite giant whom Caleb expelled (Josh. 15:14), and David himself, according to Winckler, was a Calebite. It is possible, moreover, that the names of the other Hebronite giants, Sheshai and Ahiman, are identical with the Jerahmeelite Sheshan and Ahban (*שֶׁשַׁי* = *שֶׁשָׁן*) in 1 Chron. 2:29, 31.

³⁷ For David's attitude to others *cf.* § 2, d).

³⁸ If, in the present arrangement of the MT, Tamar's outrage occurred shortly after the birth of Solomon, and the events in 1 Kings, chap. 1, were referred to the year after Absalom's revolt, it is conceivable that this scheme rests upon an old tradition that Solomon was twelve years old when he came to the throne; *cf.* Nestle (*ZATW.*, Vol. II, p. 312), who, instead of the four years in 15:7, reckons the three in 21:1, and the one implied in 24:8; see also Kaufmann, *ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 185. If we prefer to reckon the four years in 15:7, it would appear that this scheme ignores chaps. 21-24.

had settled in Jerusalem. It was possibly this very action which caused or encouraged the rising. A close examination of the chapters comprising this section will show that the narrative bears several traces of later revision. A tendency to include in the revolt the northern tribes (under the designation "Israel") may be especially noticed.

d) Chap. 15 narrates the commencement of Absalom's revolt. He prepares a chariot and horses and fifty men to run behind him (vs. 1). He secretly gains the hearts of all the men of Israel who come to Jerusalem for justice by alleging that there is none to hear their cause (vss. 2-6). Finally he obtains permission from David to go to Hebron, and prepares for revolt (vss. 7 *sqq.*). Now, vs. 1 compared with 1 Kings 1:5 shows that Absalom's deed was in itself a sign of *open* revolt, whereas vss. 2-6 represent the preparations as *gradual*. The latter, however, includes "Israel" in the revolt (*cf.* vss. 2b, 6), and may, therefore, be secondary, perhaps E (גִּבְיָהּ לְבָ, vs. 6; *cf.* Gen. 31:20 E). Again, vs. 7 ("and Absalom said," etc.) reads like another account of the commencement of the revolt,³⁹ and may be older than vs. 1. It is hardly likely that Absalom would have been able to depart for Hebron after openly revolting, and it is possible that vs. 1 has been derived from 1 Kings 1:5. The notice of the sending of the spies throughout all Israel in vs. 10 is probably also due to E; for the characteristic מְרַגְּלִים see on 10:3 above (§ 3, c), note). The narrative continues with the flight of David and the interview with Ittai the Gittite (vs. 19, נָטַי in Hexateuch E and D). The passage relating the meeting with Zadok and Abiathar is twofold, and appears to be fragmentary: (1) the ark is brought to David, but is sent back (vss. 24-26, 29); (2) the priests, accompanied by their sons (vs. 27, "your two sons with you"), are told to return to Jerusalem, and David undertakes to tarry at the fords until tidings reach him. It is quite conceivable that (1) has been introduced by a later editor unable to see how Zadok and Abiathar could be mentioned apart from the ark.⁴⁰ On the other hand, the close relation between vss. 23a and 30b, and the fact that in vs. 23b (Lucian) the people are passing before the king along the way to the "Olive," at which, according to vs. 18b (*cf.* LXX, and on the text see Wellhausen,

³⁹ The chronological notice (vs. 7a) may be an insertion in accordance with the scheme referred to above.

⁴⁰ We must also admit the existence of glosses; *cf.* Wellhausen, Budde, *ad loc.*

Driver, *ad loc.*), they had already arrived, makes it probable that the whole passage has been loosely inserted. The order of the names of the priests may be noticed; Abiathar was in reality the older priest, and Zadok did not attain priority until after Solomon's accession (*cf.* 1 Kings 2:35).

David then goes up by the ascent of the "Olive" and hears of Ahithophel's treachery (vs. 31; for סכל *cf.* on 24:10 above, § 2, *a*), note). He commissions Hushai to pervert the counsel of the Gilonite and tells him "whatsoever thou shalt hear out of the king's house, thou shalt tell it to Zadok and Abiathar the priests" (vs. 35). The latter by means of their sons will keep David informed (vs. 36; *cf.* vs. 27). Passing over for the present the interviews with Ziba and Shimei (16:1-14), we find Absalom and Ahithophel in Jerusalem (16:15), where they meet Hushai, who is able to explain away his apparent faithlessness to David (vss. 16 *sqq.*). Hushai is designated the "Archite" (אַרְכִי), an ethnic of uncertain origin, possibly derived from some locality in the Negeb. His title "friend of David" (רֵעֵה דָוִד) is not clear; it was perhaps used generally of David's south Judean clients or associates (*cf.* 1 Sam. 30:26*a*).⁴¹ In vs. 17 רֵעֵה is employed in its ordinary sense (David is Hushai's רֵעֵה): the writer of this verse was apparently unaware of its use as a title, and when in the following verse Hushai speaks of Absalom's seizure of the throne as the choice of Yahweh and "all the men of Israel," it is difficult to avoid seeing in vss. 17 *sq.* a redactional insertion.

e) Chaps. 16:20-17:23 narrate the advice given by Ahithophel and Hushai. That of the former is twofold. His first counsel (vss. 21-23), to which reference is made in the late 12:11 *sqq.*,⁴² was acted upon by Absalom. The incident, however, must be taken in connection with 15:16 and 20:3, the necessary notices of the wives and concubines left behind in Jerusalem. Now, neither of these belongs to the original narrative. The former is obviously a gloss (observe 15:17*a* = 16*a*); on the latter see below, § 5, *a*); and the use of הַנִּיחַ and עָזַב in both suggests E (*cf.* Judg. 2:21-3:1, and see Budde, p. 158). In fact, Ahithophel's first counsel

⁴¹ In Gen. 26:26 (J) "friend" is the title of an officer of Abimelech the Gerarite; similarly in 1 Kings 4:5 it appears to have a purely official application.

⁴² Chap. 12:7 *sq.*, 10-12 is the only passage which could make us place the narrative of David and Bathsheba before the revolt. In all probability it should belong later, toward the close of David's life.

is wholly independent of the context and may be safely omitted from the oldest form of the narrative.

The story of Ahithophel's second counsel (17:1-4),⁴³ and the manner in which it is perverted by Hushai (vss. 5 *sqq.*), is particularly complicated and difficult. Ahithophel advises prompt action. David has but few men with him, and if he is killed these will return to Absalom "like a bride returneth to her husband" (vs. 3, LXX). This advice is politic and consistent, but is frustrated by Hushai, who counsels delay, with the result that Ahithophel in despair goes to his home and hangs himself (vs. 23). It would appear that Hushai wished to give David an opportunity of strengthening his power, although one fails to see how David could hope to do this, especially as he takes refuge in Ammon, which, according to the received view, he had formerly decimated. Hushai counsels Absalom to gather Israel from "Dan to Beersheba" (vs. 11; *cf.* above on 3:10, § 1, *b*), but Absalom has already gained over all the people (*cf.* 16:15; 17:14, 24). If Hushai's advice had been preferred, it must have been acted upon after Absalom had crossed the Jordan, since from vs. 24 it appears that the latter was in close pursuit of David. Finally, in spite of Ahithophel's defeat, the fact remains that Hushai's counsel need never have been given. It is not alluded to in vs. 21, and, notwithstanding the approval of Absalom and "all the men of Israel" (vs. 14), it does not appear to have been followed: vs. 21, indeed, clearly showing that it was upon hearing Ahithophel's advice, and that alone, that David fled across the Jordan. Several less important difficulties and inconcinnities are found in the account of the spies, vss. 15-20. In vss. 15, 16 Hushai tells the priests of the advice tendered by Ahithophel and himself. The scene suddenly shifts to En-rogel, where Jonathan and Ahimaaz are in regular communication with David (vs. 17, the tenses are frequentative). This implies that vss. 17 and 15 *sq.* are not from the same hand, or that there is a lacuna between vss. 16 and 17. Again, in vs. 20*a* Absalom's servants know at once where the spies are concealed, which suggests that the scene is still laid at En-Rogel. Possibly two traditions have been combined; the one placed the spies and the well at a woman's house in En-Rogel, the other at a man's house in Bahurim.

⁴³ The "moreover" of 17:1 EV is misleading.

From a consideration of the difficulties in 16:20—17:23 it is probable that we may discover three strands in the narrative: (*a*) Ahithophel counsels immediate action; the spies hear of this and tell David, who at once crosses the Jordan (16:20(?); 17:1-4 17-22); (*β*) a later hand has told how Ahithophel's advice was frustrated by Hushai (17:5-14, 23); finally there has been added (*γ*) the nefarious advice of Ahithophel (16:21-23), the writer of which is no doubt responsible for those passages with which it is so closely connected (see above). Of the three (*a*) is doubtless the oldest, and to the editor who inserted (*β*) we owe the harmonizing link 17:15, 16, and probably also 15:27, 28, 35, 36. It is not impossible even that he is also the author of 15:31-34; 16:16-19.

f) The conclusion of the chapter narrates David's arrival in Mahanaim and his hospitable reception at the hands of Shobi, Machir, and Barzillai (17:24-29; with 29*b* cf. 16:2*b*). Absalom passes over the Jordan and makes Amasa "captain of the host" in the place of Joab (17:25*a*; cf. 1 Kings 2:32). The latter statement is intelligible only on the assumption that there existed at this time an "army" or "host" (צבא), such as is mentioned in the account of the great wars (chaps. 8, 10), and that Absalom had control over it; in other words, that all Israel was on his side.

It has always been difficult to understand David's favorable reception among the Ammonites, whom, according to the MT arrangement of 2 Samuel, he had previously crushed. It is precarious to base any argument of relationship upon the fact that Nahash appears both as an Ammonite and Judean name (2 Sam. 10:2; 17:25*b*), since in the latter passage the correct reading is no doubt "Jesse" (see Klostermann, *ad loc.*). Of the three names mentioned in 17:27 that of Shobi (ben Nahash) alone is unknown. Now, the omission of the verb after "Mahanaim" makes the verse unbearably heavy,⁴⁴ and in accordance with Hebrew idiom one expects in place of ושב a verb in the imperfect with *waw* consecutive. For "and Shobi ben Nahash" (ושבי בן נחש) should we not read "and Nahash . . . brought" (· · · · · ויבא נחש בן)? בן was inserted before נחש to make sense after ויבא had become corrupted to ושב. This Nahash of Rabbah is the king mentioned in 10:1 *sq.*, a chapter which has

⁴⁴ Budde, *SBOT.*, and others read הבריא at the beginning of vs. 28, but the construction is still awkward; for a parallel cf. the late 2 Chron. 31:6.

been taken (on other grounds) to refer to a time following the revolt of Absalom; and we are now able to understand the nature of the kindness which Hanun's father had shown to David, and which the latter was so eager to repay.

g) Chap. 18 narrates the fight between Absalom and David. The army of the latter, according to Josephus (*Antiquities*, vii, 10, 1), numbered 4,000 men, which from its extreme moderation invites confidence (*cf.* Mez, *Josephus*, p. 76). With the exception of vss. 6–8 the chapter hangs round Absalom. Here the wood in which Absalom met his death becomes one which causes the loss of more men than the battle itself. Its name is variously given as the "wood of Ephraim" (MT) or "Mahanaim" (Luc.); Josephus, on the other hand, locates the fight in the Great Plain (*cf.* vs. 23*b*). It was probably wanting in the original narrative, and in vs. 6*b* we should read simply בִּישָׁר; *cf.* Budde, *SBOT*, *ad loc.*

Absalom's death is ascribed in vs. 14 to Joab, but in vs. 15 to Joab's armor-bearers. It is difficult to evade this inconsistency, since the statement in vs. 15 is clear and precise (הַמִּית, not מוֹתָהוּ as in 1:10), and it is at least remarkable that neither here nor in David's final charge to Solomon (1 Kings, chap. 2) is there anything to support vs. 14. It is difficult to treat vs. 15 as a gloss, and if we bear in mind such passages as 3:29, 39; 16:10, etc., which are filled with bitterness against Joab, it becomes easier to suppose that vs. 15 is original, and that vs. 14 represents a later polemical tradition.

The latter part of the chapter tells how the news of Absalom's death reached David. Of הַכּוּשִׁי "the Cushite" we know nothing, unless the name be an old error for הַחֹשִׁי "Hushai." "Cush" may very probably refer to the Arabian tribe of that name, and the Cushite bearer of bad tidings finds a parallel in the Amalekite of chap. 1.

In chap. 19 David, mourning the fate of his favorite son, is persuaded to show himself to his people. Vss. 9*b*–11, 12*b*⁴⁵ are an insertion to magnify the size of the rebellion; note the mention of "Israel" in vs. 9*b* (*cf.* 18:17*b*), and נָרַךְ, vs. 10 (the verb in Hexateuch only E). David sends to Zadok and Abiathar to persuade the elders of Judah to recall him, and by offering to Amasa the position formerly held by Joab is ultimately reconciled

⁴⁵ Vs. 12*b* is misplaced and should follow immediately upon vs. 11.

to his subjects. Now Amasa is expressly associated with Judah (*cf.* 1 Kings 2:32), and seems to have possessed considerable influence over the tribe; and unless we are to suppose that David had already become king over the northern tribes, his offer is equivalent to investing him with a post which he already held.

The rebellion has now ended, the men of Judah come to Gilgal, and David returns to the Jordan (vs. 16). The rest of the chapter is taken up with David's interviews with Shimei, Mephibosheth, and Barzillai, and ends with the commencement of Sheba's rising.

§ 5. *Chapters 19:41—20:22: Sheba's revolt.*—*a)* When Judah had become reconciled with David and had come to conduct the king over the Jordan, only half Israel accompanied them (19:41). A certain ill-feeling had sprung up between the North and South which culminated in the revolt of Sheba the Bichrite.⁴⁶ He is followed by all Israel, and Judah alone, "from the Jordan to Jerusalem,"⁴⁷ remains faithful to David. David returns to Jerusalem and sends Amasa to collect the men of Judah (19:42—20:4). Such is the commencement of the new revolt. It presents an entirely new situation, which does not harmonize with the impression left after the reconciliation of David with his people. It presupposes a wholly different disruption, and one, indeed, which is scarcely credible when we recollect the eager longing expressed by Israel for the return of David (19:12). It is highly probable that here again the size of the revolt has been magnified and that from the LXX of 20:14 we may obtain a more intelligible idea of the size of Sheba's following. From this verse we learn that Sheba was attended only by his clansmen, the Bichrites (*cf.* Driver, *ad loc.*), a representation which is in obvious harmony with the continuation of the story in vss. 15 *sqq.* Here Sheba with his small following is put to flight and finds refuge in Abel-beth-Maacah. The city is besieged by Joab, and to save themselves the inhabitants cut off Sheba's head. Thus the short-lived rebellion ceases and Joab returns in victory to the king (20:22). The chapter ends with a (misplaced) list of officers almost identical with that in 8:16 *sqq.*; see above, § 2, *c*).

⁴⁶ It is a very probable conjecture that Saul also belonged to the Bichrites (in 1 Sam. 10:21 read בכרי for מטרי, and *cf.* Marquart, *Fundamente*, p. 14). The only other Benjamite clan-name mentioned in Samuel is Gera, to which belonged the well-known Shimei.

⁴⁷ The "Jordan" seems to represent a river on the south border of Judah; *cf.* Winckler, *Geschichte*, Vol. I, p. 174, note 2.

Now, vss. 14-22 form a continuous and straightforward account of the end of Sheba's revolt, and in all probability may be assigned to E.⁴⁸ The original commencement, on the other hand, can with difficulty be determined, inasmuch as there are several signs of redaction and insertion. A trace of this is seen, for example, in the artificial "half Israel" in 19:41b, and in the "ten (or eleven, Josephus, *Antiquities*, VII, 11:5) parts," 19:44, an obvious reference to the tribes that fell away under Jeroboam. The idea that "Joseph" is first-born rather than "Judah" (vs. 44; for text cf. *SBOT.*) is naturally Ephraimite (cf. Gen., chap. 48; 1 Chron. 5:1 sq.). Chap. 20:1b and 2b are almost identical with 1 Kings 12:16, 20b, and the writer seems to have in his mind a recollection of the separation of the two kingdoms. In fact, the account of Sheba's rising has been artificially affixed to the close of the revolt of Absalom, and the hand of the redactor who is responsible for this is to be seen again in the statement that David returned to Jerusalem (vs. 3a),⁴⁹ and explains the inconsistency between 19:41 sq. (Judah with David), and 20:4 (Amasa collects Judah). If Sheba revolted when David was at Gilgal, why was it necessary to collect the men of Judah who were already with David, and why should David return to Jerusalem? If, on the other hand, Sheba's rising was quite independent of Absalom's revolt, and occurred when David was in Jerusalem, the summoning of Judah is quite intelligible.

b) The confused state of the commencement of the revolt is self-evident. In vss. 4 sq. Amasa is sent to collect Judah in three days, but stays beyond the time allotted. Abishai is sent in pursuit of Sheba, and is accompanied by Joab (vss. 6 sq.; in vs. 7a read וַיֵּצֵאוּ אַחֲרָי אֲבִישַׁי with Budde, *SBOT.*), the Cherethites and Pelethites. Vss. 8 sqq. deal with the murder of Amasa, whom we find, strangely enough, in Gibeon. The account of Amasa's murder (vss. 8-10a, 11-13a) is scarcely original in its present position; one may note the reiterations (vss. 7b, 10b, 13b) which

⁴⁸ קָהַל (vs. 14b K^{eri}) in Hexateuch D (Deut. 4:10; 31:12) and P, but once E in Exod. 32:1 קָהַל J in Gen. 49:6; Numb. 22:4, but E in Numb. 16:33; 20:4). שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (*ibid.*), cf. 5:1 above, § 2, d). חֲכָמָה (vs. 16), see on 13:3 (§ 4, a). אֲמָה (vs. 17) E, cf. Holzinger, *Einleitung*, p. 183. נַחֲלַת יְהוָה (vs. 19), see 1 Sam. 26:19 (E); 2 Sam. 14:16 (§ 4a); 21:3 (§ 3a). On vs. 19 cf. Deut. 20:10 sq. In vs. 14 we should possibly transpose and read "and all the Bichrites gathered together and came after him, and they went through all the tribes," etc. Vs. 15 does not follow immediately upon vs. 14. In the latter the subject to the verb is "the Bichrites;" in vs. 15a it is obviously Joab and his followers.

⁴⁹ The rest of the verse is also due to an editor; cf. above on 16:15 sqq., § 3, e). כָּלֵל כלל "to nourish" is peculiar to E in the Hexateuch (Gen. 45:11; 47:12; 50:21).

remain when it is omitted, and the harmonizing link vs. 11. It is, nevertheless, not impossible that there may have been an independent story of Amasa (J?), and fragments of it may be preserved in Lucian's version of 20:7a ("and Amasa collected all the people"), but his association with Sheba's revolt is hardly genuine.

In vs. 6 for "Abishai" the Peshitta, followed by many critics, reads "Joab."⁵⁰ Budde (*SBOT.*), however, supports the MT. By charging Abishai, he observes, David is sure that Joab will not remain behind, and the fact that Joab soon takes the leadership into his own hands follows as a matter of course. But, as Driver, *Samuel*, *ad loc.*, points out, we need a preparation for Joab's mention in vs. 8. Joab alone is opposed to Sheba in the continuation of the narrative, and so it must have stood in the original narrative before it had been affixed to the story of Absalom's revolt. The redactor, however, was obliged to remove Joab's name in view of the preceding 19:14b, and possibly, too, introduced the account of Amasa's death in order to explain his absence in vss. 14 *sqq.* The emended אַחִישַׁי in vs. 7a (see above) is a redactional gloss, as also is אַחִישַׁי in vs. 10. The resemblance which vs. 10b bears to 2:24a leads to the discovery of several points of contact between the story of Amasa and Sheba in chap. 20 and that of Abner and Ishbaal in chap. 2. Both Abner and Sheba are followed by Benjamin (2:25; 20:14). The murders of Asahel and Amasa are narrated in very similar terms (2:23 *sq.*; 20:10a, 12, 13a). Gibeon recurs in each (2:12 *sq.*; 20:8); and the end of the war is similarly described (2:28; 20:22b). Hence it is possible that the same redactor has worked at both chaps. 2 *sq.* and 20. Amasa and Abner are to a certain extent parallel characters, the former "captain of the host of Judah," the latter "captain of the host of Israel;" each possessed considerable influence, and, though separated from one another by a score of years, in the received chronology are mentioned together in 1 Kings 2:5, 32 (the same redactor here?).

c) It is not easy to fix the approximate date of Sheba's revolt, more especially since Amasa's connection with it is a later feature. At all events, the northern tribes are treated with leniency, and, as Winckler has observed, do not yet appear to be under David's

⁵⁰ Lucian: ἀμεσσα, *i. e.*, "Amasa."

sway—in other words, David has not yet become king over all Israel (*Geschichte*, Vol. I, p. 174).

Since reason has been found for separating the narratives of Absalom and Sheba, it is useful to observe where Absalom's revolt ceases in the present MT. It must be one of the two closely related verses, 19:16 or 41, where Judah has come to escort David over the Jordan. It can hardly be the latter, however, since this is due to the redactor who is preparing the way for the introduction of Sheba's revolt. The narrative, accordingly, ends abruptly in 19:16 with the short notice of the arrival of the men of Judah at Gilgal. May it be conjectured that a writer concluded with the description of some such solemn festival or renewal of the kingdom as is mentioned in 1 Sam. 11:14 *sq.* (also at Gilgal)?

Of more importance for our present purpose is the corollary that the interviews in 19:17 *sqq.* do not belong to the original account of Absalom's revolt. This is the more suggestive since the corresponding interviews in chap. 16 also show traces of having been inserted; *cf.* the doublets 15:37⁵¹ (Lucian adds "and Ahithophel with him") and 16:15.

§ 6. *The interviews in chaps. 16, 19.*—The interviews in question deal with Ziba, Meribbaal, Shimei, and Barzillai, all Benjamites, with the exception of the last-named, and closely related to the house of Saul.

a) The passages in 2 Samuel which refer to Meribbaal the son of Jonathan, and Ziba his servant, comprise chaps. 9 (and 4:4); 16:1–4; 19:25–31 (in 19:18*a* the mention of Ziba is due to a gloss), and 21:7 (gloss; see above § 3, *a*). These mutually related passages are independent of the rest of the book. In 16:1 David leaves Hushai and meets Ziba at the top of the "Olive." Meribbaal, he is told, is remaining in Jerusalem in the hope that the "house of Israel" (vs. 3*b*; *cf.* on 1:12) would restore to him his father's kingdom. It is proper to ask whether the Benjamite claimant would expect to find support by remaining in Jerusalem. It is difficult to understand what interests Judah and Benjamin may have shared, and unlikely as any conjoint action would be toward the close of David's reign, it becomes almost impossible if we are right in dating the revolt soon after David settled in Jerusalem. Would Absalom tolerate a rival in

⁵¹ Where "city" in *a* = "Jerusalem" in *b*.

the shape of another claimant, or did he hope to conciliate Benjamin and thus obtain a free hand in his own plans, which, we have concluded, were with Judah alone? No adequate explanation seems possible. In 19:25–31 Meribbaal comes to meet David at the Jordan, and is able to find an excuse for his apparent treachery. But David is only half convinced, and his estate is divided with his servant.⁵² Whatever be its true origin, this passage at all events is hardly in its original position. In fact, it seems not improbable that, like chap. 9, the scene was originally laid in Jerusalem. This is still represented in the LXX of vs. 26, where Meribbaal comes to David “to Jerusalem” (so also Lucian; MT simply **ירושלם**, for which most critics read **מיר**, see Driver, *ad loc.*);⁵³ and again in 25*b* Lucian rightly reads “until the day he came in peace to Jerusalem.” The changes in the MT were rendered necessary when the passage was inserted in its present position.

b) The interviews with Shimei are of greater importance. In 16:5 *sqq.* Shimei encounters David at Bahurim, and follows him with curses. His words in 8*a* are clearly a reference to the slaughter of Saul’s sons by the Gibeonites, 21:1–14, on which passage see § 3, *a*). His attitude, on the other hand, is unintelligible. Is his the language one would expect from a Benjamite? Would not Absalom be as distasteful a king as David had been? Why was not Shimei supporting Meribbaal in his endeavor to recover the throne of his father? After David’s victory Shimei with a thousand Benjamites joins the men of Judah and meets the king “as he was about to pass the Jordan” (19:17 *sqq.*). In the interview which follows one may note especially vss. 22 *sqq.*, the familiar reproach addressed to the sons of Zeruiah (*cf.* 3:28 *sq.*, 39; 16:10), and vs. 23*b*, where David seems to realize, as it were for the first time, that he is king over Israel.⁵⁴ May not Shimei’s curse and subsequent confession have been written in view of David’s treatment of the sons of Saul (2 Sam., chap.

⁵² For **מלאך האלהים** (19:28) *cf.* on 14:17 above, § 4, *a*). **רגל** (*ibid.*) E; see Budde, p. 145.

⁵³ Josephus, too, states that when the ambassadors came to David he went to Jerusalem (*Antiquities*, VII, 11:2). *Cf.* also vs. 31*b*: “unto his own house.”

⁵⁴ Note also **לעמתי** (16:13), a late expression. Its repetition is quite unnecessary, and may have arisen from a corruption of the place-name which is needed in vs. 14. **איש הדמים** (16:7) is found only in Psalms and Proverbs. **העיר** (19:20), *cf.* 24:17 above, § 2, *a*), and note that in 1 Kings 8:47 the passage has been worked over by D²; see Kuenen, § 25, note 2. “Anointed of Yahweh” (19:22), see on 1:14; and for David’s words 19:23*b* see 1 Sam. 11:13 R^{JE}.

21), and may it not find an analogy in the tradition wherein David's sin with Bathsheba is atoned by the death of the son (see above, § 3, *b*)? But although we suspect that the interviews with Shimei are, in their present form at least, later than J (due to R^{JE}?), there is no doubt some genuine tradition in the person of this Benjamite. It is impossible to conjecture with much confidence what this may have been. Was Shimei at the head of some revolt against David? At all events the size of his following sufficiently indicates his power (2 Sam. 19:18).⁵⁵ The mention of the "wood of Ephraim" (18:6), apparently to the east of Jordan, has caused suspicion, and Reuss has suggested, accordingly, that we may find traces of a combination of two narratives, in which case it would be natural to connect the revolt of Absalom with the one, and that of Shimei with the other. Finally, it may be noticed that the wording of 1 Kings 2:8 compared with *ibid.* vs. 7*b* suggests that David's journey to Mahanaim and his flight from Absalom were not on the same occasion.⁵⁶

c) Lastly, we have the interview with Barzillai the Gileadite. In 2 Sam. 17:27 he appears to be in some way associated with the unknown Rogelim. Now in vs. 28 the LXX read *καὶ ἀμφιτάτους* (*i. e.*, *וּמִרְבָּדִים*; see Driver, Budde, etc.) after *מִשְׁכָּב*. This is supported by Lucian's *ἐκ πακαβειν*, which appears to be a misreading of *מִרְבָּדִים* (read as *מִרְכָּבִים*), and a still more corrupt form, it may be conjectured, is to be seen in *מִרְגָּלִים* (MT, "from Rogelim"), which was erroneously removed to the end of vs. 27 after it had become corrupt.⁵⁷ The writer of 19:32 *sqq.* has simply perpetuated the error which he found before him, and that he belonged to E may be conjectured from his use of *כָּלכָּל*, vs. 34 (see on 20:3 above, § 5, *a*). In common with the rest of these interviews the presence of *c* is with great probability to be ascribed to R^{JE}.

§ 7. 1 *Kings*, chaps. 1, 2: *the conclusion of the history of David*.—In chap. 1 we have the account of a palace intrigue which

⁵⁵ One observes that the tribes of Geba and Bichri, to which Shimei and Sheba, respectively, belonged, are the only Benjamite clans mentioned in Samuel. The names of these Benjamites are sufficiently similar to lead to the suggestion that some confusion has taken place.

⁵⁶ Hence one is tempted to find in *עֲמָתוֹר* (16:13), "Amathus," which was on the way from Jerusalem to Mahanaim. It is unmentioned in the Old Testament. The *Jerus. Talm.* identifies with Zaphon Josh. 13:27; Judg. 12:1, against which see Buhl, *Geogr. Paläst.*, p. 259.

⁵⁷ *מִרְבָּדִים*, accordingly, has been corrupted to *מִרְגָּלִים* (MT), and *מִרְכָּבִים* (Lucian). An intermediate form of the corruption is to be seen in the Peshitta, which read *מִרְבָּבִים*.

culminates in the accession of Solomon to the throne. The fragmentary nature of the narrative is evident from the unintelligible reference to Shimei and Rei in vs. 8, and difficulties have been found in Nathan's zeal for Bathsheba, in his title "the prophet," and in the account of Solomon's anointing; see Stade, *ZATW.*, Vol. III, pp. 186 sq.; Schwally, *ibid.*, Vol. XII, p. 153. It is possible, however, from the double entrance of Bathsheba (vss. 15, 28) and Nathan (vss. 22, 32), that vss. 11-14 and 28-31, which record Nathan's zeal for Bathsheba, are secondary (see below). Moreover, the chapter seems to have undergone some redaction toward the end. Vs. 47b can scarcely belong to Adonijah's speech; the analogy of Gen. 47:31 suggests rather that David is on his death-bed.

Chap. 2 relates David's last charges and the means by which Solomon established his throne. It falls into three parts: (a) vss. 1-12, (b) vss. 12-35, (c) vss. 36-46.

a) Vss. 3, 4, 10-12 are admittedly due to R^D; vs. 2a, "I go the way of all the earth," may be compared with Josh. 23:14 (D²), and for 2b see 1 Sam. 4:9 (E, פִּי "to be courageous," generally D; see Gesenius-Brown, *Hebrew Lexicon*, s. v., p. 304a). Vss. 5-9 remain. For vss. 8 sq. see below, c). The unfriendly feeling toward Joab (vss. 5 sq.) recurs elsewhere only in passages whose genuineness is not free from suspicion, and on the association of Abner and Amasa, see above on 2 Sam., chap. 20 (§ 5, b). Vs. 7, it is true, may be old, but the mention of Barzillai in 19:32 sqq. is probably due to a later hand (§ 6, c). The suspicion which attaches itself to (a) is increased by the parallelism between 1:47b; 2:1, and Gen. 47:31, 29a (J), which suggests that 2:1 originally stood before 1:47b and has been wrested from its original position by the writer or editor of (a).

b) Adonijah and the leaders of the revolt are removed. Adonijah requests Bathsheba to induce Solomon to grant him Abishag as wife (vss. 13 sqq.). He refers to his having been the legitimate heir, but, in accordance with the view of the deuteronomist (see 2 Sam. 7:12 sqq.; 1 Kings 8:20; D), acknowledges that Solomon's accession was the choice of Yahweh. His words in vs. 15 directly contradict 1 Kings 1:20, where the king's successor is unknown. Solomon, more quick-witted than the queen-mother, perceives the true nature of his brother's request, and has him put to death; for vs. 24 see 2 Sam. 7:11, 13. But, one is forced

to ask, is the episode historical? Adonijah's life has been conditionally spared, and yet he, the unsuccessful but rightful heir, goes to the mother of the reigning king with a request which in the ideas of the age was equivalent to the claim of his brother's inheritance (see Robertson Smith, *Kinship*, pp. 89 *sq.*). The resemblance which the alleged offense bears to 2 Sam. 3:7 *sqq.*; 16:21 *sqq.*, which have been ascribed to a hand later than J, *on other grounds*, is noteworthy. The passage connects itself with the introductory notice of Abishag in 1 Kings 1:1-4 (vs. 15*b* is a gloss), and is another proof that chap. 1 has undergone revision.⁵⁸

Abiathar (vss. 26 *sq.*) is exiled to his "fields" at Anathoth (for מדרה vs. 26*a*; cf. on 9:7 § 3, *a*), his life is spared, inasmuch as he had accompanied David in his flight from Saul (1 Sam. 22:20 *sqq.*, J; so Budde), and had borne the "*ephod*" (so read for "ark;" cf. 1 Sam. 23:6, a gloss, and on 2 Sam. 15:24 see above, § 4, *d*). His place is taken by Zadok, of whose origin the earlier writings have nothing to tell us; it is probable that he occupied no important position until his promotion by Solomon. There is little else to observe except the brevity of this notice, for vs. 27*b*, at least, is admittedly a gloss.

Joab, hearing the tidings, flees to the "tent of Yahweh" (a noteworthy expression), and seizes hold of the "horns of the altar" (vs. 28; cf. 1:50). He is slain by Jehoiada, who takes his post (vss. 28-34). In this passage attention may be drawn to the idioms "put away innocent blood" (vs. 31; cf. Deut. 19:13; 21:8 *sq.*), and "Yahweh shall return his blood," etc. (vs. 32; cf. Judg. 9:24, 57, R^{JE}; see Moore, *SBOT*). Joab, like Adonijah, is not put to death for participating in the intrigue; his crime has been the murder of the two captains Abner and Amasa (vss. 31 *sqq.*); see above, *a*), and cf. § 5, *b*). There is also a hint in vs. 22 that he has been suspected of complicity in Adonijah's new plot.

c) Lastly, Shimei's life is spared conditionally. Three years later he goes to Achish, king of Gath (one is surprised to find him still alive!) in pursuit of some runaway servants, and on his return is put to death by Benaiah, who has apparently resumed his former position of "head of the guard" (vss. 36 *sqq.*; cf. Bonk,

⁵⁸ Thus at the end of the chapter for עֵינֵי רֵאָוֹת (vs. 48) cf. 2 Sam. 24:3 (§ 2, *a*), and note that the "horns of the altar" are first mentioned in Jer. 17:1 (Am. 3:14*b* a gloss; see Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten* [3d edition], p. 78).

ZATW., Vol. XI, p. 143). The relation between vss. 44*a* and 42*a*, 46*b* and 45*b* suggests that 44–45 is an insertion (the EV “moreover” is not found in the MT). David’s charge to Solomon concerning Shimei (MT, vss. 8–9) is repeated in the LXX in a slightly different form immediately before *c*. Following Kittel (Vol. II, p. 51) we may prefer the LXX text and arrangement to the present MT. Hence it is to be inferred that the whole episode (vss. 36–46, preceded by the LXX form of the introduction) is an independent passage unrelated to 1 Kings, chap. 2, and that when it was inserted in its present position the introductory formula was removed and adapted in order to find a place for it among the charges in vss. 1 *sqq.*⁵⁹ For the other “Shimei” narratives, see above § 6, *b*), and note that דָּבָר (2:9) is perhaps a sign of E (2 Sam. 14:2; see § 4, *a*).

The LXX version of chap. 2 contains much additional matter, partly derived from later portions of Solomon’s history, and, on the whole, is not of any great value. This arrangement, however, is of interest, inasmuch as it shows that at a comparatively late date the work of revision and redaction was not finally completed. Like 2 Sam., chaps. 5–8, 21–24, with which its heterogeneous character makes it a fair parallel, the LXX version of 1 Kings, chap. 2, concludes with a list of officers, which, apart from its connection with 1 Kings 4:1–6, presents some distinctive features of its own.

1 Kings, chaps. 1, 2, conclude the history of David and at the same time introduce Solomon. The chapters have been revised and adapted to form a link of connection between the history of David and that of Solomon; already in chap. 1 we seem to be passing from an old narrator to the redactor. The general impression of David’s weakness conveyed in chap. 1, compared with his acute calculations in 2:1–9, is as striking as the sudden change in Solomon from the helpless infant, in the early part of chap. 1, to the clever, far-seeing king in chaps. 1:51 *sqq.*; 2 (*cf.*, *e. g.*, his treatment of Adonijah’s request). Moreover, there is much in favor of the view that 1 Kings, chap. 2, has been written to shift from Solomon’s shoulders the bloodshed incurred in establishing his throne (Wellhausen, Stade, etc.). The improbable character of the excuse for Adonijah’s death, as well as the fact that the incident of Shimei seems to be an insertion, may be urged

⁵⁹ *Cf.* Benzinger, *Könige*, *ad. loc.*, whose commentary unfortunately appeared too late for the present writer to make use of in the above section.

against those who support the genuineness of chap. 2 on the grounds that Solomon's conduct was not exclusively determined by a reference to the revolt. It is a more difficult question to determine whether *a* and *b* (see above) are double attempts to frame an excuse for Solomon, or whether chap. 2 (as well as the latter part of chap. 1) owes its present form to repeated revision. In the former case we may refer to 1 Sam., chaps. 2-4, where both E² (chaps. 2, 3) and R^D (2:27-36) have paved the way for the loss of the ark, which the earliest writer (E¹) had related without comment.⁶⁰ In the latter case the suggestion that *c* is a later addition leads to the conjecture that the passages referring to Adonijah and Joab have had a similar origin, and that in 2:35 we have an old fragment upon which 2:5, 6, 28-34 and 2:26, 27 have been based.

Perhaps the second alternative is more probable. The double entrance of Bathsheba (1:15, 28) and Nathan (1:22, 32), already referred to, may arise from the fact that the original sequel to Adonijah's revolt has been replaced by vss. 28 *sqq.* This may account for the suddenness with which Solomon appears to take the place of David. That 1:47*b* and 2:1 are not in their original position has been suggested above. In chap. 2 we find old fragments in 2:1, 7 (?), and 35. To these have been added (*a*) Adonijah's request, 2:13-25, which involves 1:1-4, 15*b*, and possibly 1:50-53, (*b*) Joab, 2:5, 6, 28-34, (*c*) Abiathar, 2:26, 27, and (*d*) Shimei, 2:8, 9, 36 *sqq.* The verses which remain (2:2-4, 10-12, 44, 45) are probably from R^D.

§ 8. *General results.*—Frequently in the course of the preceding pages the present writer has found it impossible to do more than point out the difficulties which a passage contained, or indicate traces of interpolation and revision. To present a systematic and precise table of the results of these investigations would hardly be possible at the present stage of the inquiry, and it must suffice for the present to sum up briefly the general conclusions which have been reached.

The large amount of revision which we have found makes it probable that there were several recensions of David's life extant. "Such books as Samuel . . . had little place in the synagogue service, while the interest of the narrative caused them to be largely read in private. But private study gave no such guarantee

⁶⁰ It might also be noticed that both Lucian and Josephus end their books of Samuel at 1 Kings 2:11.

against the introduction of various readings as was afforded by use in public worship . . . a student might not hesitate to make on his own copy notes or small additions . . . or even to add a paragraph. . . . Under such circumstances, and in the absence of official supervision, the multiplication of copies opened an easy door to the multiplication of errors" (Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* [2d edition], p. 84). If these remarks are true of the copyist, do they not apply equally to the editor, and if such a procedure opens the door to the multiplication of textual errors, does it not supply an easy entrance for later accretions? The figure of David is one that would very naturally lend itself to vigorous treatment at the hands of later writers. Was the chronicler really the first to idealize David?

Turning to the narratives themselves we find traces of two distinct redactors, a later one, whose hand is seen especially in chaps. 5-8, 21-24, 16:20-23, and the related passages, 15:16; 20:3, and an earlier (R^{JE}?), seen chiefly in chaps. 1-4, and Absalom's revolt. In the revolt, the hand which added the interviews with Meribbaal is probably responsible for the introduction of chap. 9. It is in the chapters worked over by the earlier redactor that we find passages which bear traces of Ephraimite origin tending to combine the histories of David and the house of Saul; they emphasize the former's good-will toward the latter, and betray here and there a marked bitter feeling toward the sons of Zeruiah.

Finally, we may note the efforts made to antedate David's supremacy over all Israel. The editors of chaps. 5-8, 21-24 (a collection of passages relating to various periods of David's life) made it the immediate result of Ishbaal's death (§ 3, *a*). The editor of chaps. 15-20 ascribed it to a period preceding the revolts of Absalom and Sheba. Both, originally, were purely tribal, and have been revised to adapt them to a period when David's sovereignty was extended over "all Israel," a record of which event is not given by any old narrator. The inclusion of "Israel" in Absalom's rebellion is connected with the appending of Sheba's rising, and to this hand we may perhaps ascribe the removal of the Ammonite war (chap. 10) from its original position after the revolt (*cf.* § 4). Since chaps. 21-24 are a comparatively late addition to 2 Samuel, it follows that, when the account of David and Bathsheba was artificially connected with

the Ammonite war (§ 3, *b*), it must have stood immediately before 1 Kings, chap. 1. The birth of Solomon probably happened but a short while before the revolt of Adonijah, and the event may have been accompanied by some such promise as is referred to in 1 Kings 1:13; 17:30.

From these evidences we draw two conclusions: (1) the union of Judah and Israel under one king did not occur at any early date in David's reign, and (2) the narratives in 2 Samuel which presuppose any close relationship between Judah and Israel (or Benjamin) previous to this union are due to a redactor (R^{JE}?), and, in several cases at least, as is only to be expected, seem to be derived from an Ephraimite source. Subsequent history shows how loose was the union of North and South, and the ease with which the separation was effected after a few years of joint rule under David and Solomon (considered in the light of the second conclusion) favors the view that Judah, previous to the union, had never stood in any close relationship to Israel (or Benjamin), a view which, if not new, is now perhaps shown to be supported, so far as 2 Samuel at least is concerned, by the internal evidence of the narratives themselves. A discussion of the bearing of this view upon the earlier history of Israel in 1 Samuel must be reserved for a future occasion.⁶¹

⁶¹ The above would argue against David's connection with Bethlehem. A home to the south of Judah seems to be required, and if exogamy was really the custom in Judah—and certain indications point that way—we could determine to what clans David did *not* belong. Marquart's conjecture that he came from Arad may imply Jerahmeelite origin (*cf.* arts. David, §1, note 2, Jerahmeel, in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*). Winckler, however, suggests that the Judean clans came from the north-Arabian land of Muşri, of which Kadesh, it is highly probable, would form part. In agreement with this, we find in JE's account of the exodus traces of a movement from Kadesh direct to Judah, in connection with which we may place the capture of Hebron by Caleb (*cf.* Hebron, Kadesh, *op. cit.*). This seems to find further confirmation in the names of David's body-guard. The "Cherethites" remind us of the wady Cherith "before Jordan," *i. e.*, to the south of Judah (1 Kings 17:3; *cf.* 2 Sam. 20:2, §5a, and art. Cherith, *op. cit.*), and with the "Pelethites" we associate the Jerahmeelite "Peleth" (1 Chron. 2:33); *cf.* "Peleth" in Korah's rebellion, Numb. 16:1 ("sons" [or "son," LXX, Lucian] of Reuben" should come after "Eliab" [so in some Greek MSS. cited by Holmes and Parsons]). May we conjecture that David lived in Muşri before he took the steps which led him north to Hebron, and then farther north again to Jerusalem? His intercourse with Achish (1 Sam., chap. 27) we need not doubt; at a later time we find Yamani of Ashdod, the leader of the Ḥa-at-ti (the south-Palestinian Hittites?) taking refuge in Muşri (*cf.* art. Ashdod, *op. cit.*); friendly intercourse between Muşri and the Philistines was not unknown. That a later age placed David's youth in the district where he afterward reigned is not surprising. 1 Sam., chaps. 16-31, has been thoroughly revised (it would not be difficult, for example, to show that chap. 27 is the continuation of 23:1-13a, 14b), and this is illustrated in a striking manner by a glance at Budde's text in the *SBOT*. The source of David's history at Saul's court is almost wholly E, in his life as an outlaw in the south of Judah J predominates, and his fortunes as an independent chieftain (chaps. 27 *sqq.*) are wholly J. Later tradition, not unmindful of David's home, brought him to the south of Judah, and, if we may retain the reading in 25:1, actually sent him to the wilderness of Paran, which is practically the district of Kadesh—or Muşri.